

Appl. No. 10/064,595
Amdt. dated February 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 10, 2005

REMARKS

No amendments are made to the claims. The claims are listed above only for convenience to the Examiner.

5

1. Rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

The applicant would like to mention that the term "terminal" is well known in the art of wireless networks, and that it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in this art what
10 this term means upon reading the claim. For example, US 6,990,527 describes a network terminal and US 6,980,213 describes a terminal in a wireless network.

In addition, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (Online edition) defines terminal as "a
combination of a keyboard and output device (as a video display unit) by which data can
15 be entered into or output from a computer or electronic communications system." The applicant does not wish to rely on this definition, but merely wishes to show that the term "terminal" is widely known as related to electronic devices.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.
20

2. Rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asoh et al. (US 20040003060) in view of Mahalingaiah (US 6754214):

Asoh teaches establishing network connections following priorities (Fig.12A-B), yet
25 Mahalingaiah teaches a plurality of configuration tables as being used in packet-wise security operations. These different scopes, that of making network connections and that of securing packets, are significantly removed from each other so as to not be conducive for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the combination. For one thing, network

Appl. No. 10/064,595
Amdt. dated February 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 10, 2005

connections are desired to be stable and unchanging over a plurality of packets, whereas packet-wide security operations are desired to be performed for as many packets as possible. Thus, the applicant argues that the combination is unreasonable. One example of a shortcoming of the combination is that Mahalingaiah's security code could cause
5 switching between Asoh's networks each and every packet, rather than as selected by the user as in the invention.

The motivation mentioned by the Examiner results in a device that makes and breaks network connections with every packet received. This is a result that is unwanted in
10 networking, where stability is typically desired. Thus, no one of ordinary skill in the art would be driven by this motivation to make the combination.

Regarding claim 1:

15 The Examiner references Mahalingaiah (col. 20, line 54 - col. 21, line 15) regarding the limitation "a status pointer for representing an operational location and time." The Examiner likens the most significant bits (MSBs) of the security code to the claimed status pointer, yet the MSBs of Mahalingaiah do not hold location or time information. Thus, the claimed limitation of a status pointer for representing an operational location
20 and time has not been taught or suggested. Therefore, the following limitation:

a status pointer for representing an operational location and time;

shows that claim 1 should be patentable over the combination of Asoh and Mahalingaiah.
25

This relates back to the previous points made, in that since Mahalingaiah's security code does not hold location or time information, in the combination proposed by the Examiner, Mahalingaiah's security code could cause switching between Asoh's networks

Appl. No. 10/064,595
Amdt. dated February 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 10, 2005

each and every packet.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

5 *Regarding claim 13:*

The cited section of Mahalingaiah (col. 19, lines 5-34) deals with source addresses and destination addresses, such addresses being akin to identification numbers (col. 19, lines 10-12). These are not physical location addresses. In this section, there is no
10 mention of user preferences nor a unique list of prioritized user preferences nor an operational time and physical location of the terminal.

Clearly, the claim 13 limitation of

15 each configuration table corresponds to a unique list of prioritized user preferences for a specific operational time and physical location of the terminal

is not met by this section of Mahalingaiah.

20

Since all limitations of a claim must be taught or suggested by the combination for an obviousness rejection to stand, the applicant respectfully requests that this rejection to claim 13 be withdrawn.

25 *Conclusion:*

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-13 is requested in view of the above arguments. Claims 2-13 are dependent and should be allowed if claim 1 is found

Appl. No. 10/064,595
Amdt. dated February 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 10, 2005

allowable.

Sincerely yours,

5



Date: 02/10/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

10 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

c-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.

15 is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)